UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

)	
IN R	E YASMIN AND YAZ (DROSPIRENONE))	3:09-md-02100-DRH-PMF
MAR	RKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND	
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION) MDL No. 2100		
This	Document Relates to:	
	nerine Anderson et al. v. Bayer Corp. et al.	
No.	3:10-cv-20168-DRH-PMF ¹	
Tam	era Jirbi v. Bayer Corp. et al.	
	3:09-cv-20005-DRH-PMF	
Han	nah Nall v. Bayer Corp. et al.	
No.	3:10-cv-10023-DRH-PMF	
Brid	get Tanner v. Bayer Corp. et al.	
No.	• •	
Kris	tin Van Cuyck et al. v. Bayer Corp. et al.	
	3:10-cv-20004-DRH-PMF ²	
Cath	y Walton v. Bayer Corp. et al.	
No.	• •	

ORDER

¹ Defendant's motion applies to plaintiff Marie Jones.
² Defendant's motion applies to plaintiffs Kathleen Belt, Heather Crawford, Nettie Johnson, Anne Lewis, and Rhiannon Veenis.

HERNDON, Chief Judge:

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Bayer HealthCare

Pharmaceuticals Inc.'s motion, pursuant to Case Management Order 12 ("CMO 12"), for an Order dismissing Plaintiffs' claims in the above-captioned matters without prejudice for failure to comply with their Plaintiff Fact Sheet ("PFS") obligations.³

Under Section E of CMO 12, Plaintiffs were given 14 days from the date of Defendant's motion to file a response either certifying that they had served upon Defendants and Defendants have received a completed PFS, and attaching appropriate documentation of receipt or an opposition to Defendant's motion.

Plaintiffs in the following member actions timely filed a response that complies with the requirements of CMO 12 Section E:

- Katherine Anderson et al. v. Bayer Corp. et al. No. 3:10-cv-20168-DRH-PMF
- Tamera Jirbi v. Bayer Corp. et al. No. 3:09-cv-20005-DRH-PMF
- Bridget Tanner v. Bayer Corp. et al. No. 3:09-cv-20002-DRH-PMF
- Kristin Van Cuyck et al. v. Bayer Corp. et al. No. 3:10-cv-20004-DRH-PMF

Accordingly, with respect to these member actions (3:10-cv-20168; 3:09-cv-20005; 3:09-cv-20002; 3:10-cv-20004), Defendant's motion is denied as moot.

³ Under Section C of CMO 12, each Plaintiff is required to serve Defendants with a completed PFS, including a signed Declaration, executed record release Authorizations, and copies of all documents subject to the requests for production contained in the PFS which are in the possession of Plaintiff. Section B of CMO 12 further provides that a completed PFS is due "45 days from the date of service of the first answer to her Complaint or the docketing of her case in this MDL, or 45 days from the date of this Order, whichever is later."

Plaintiffs in (1) Hannah Nall v. Bayer Corp. et al. No. 3:10-cv-10023-DRH-PMF and (2) Cathy Walton v. Bayer Corp. et al. No. 3:09-cv-10217-DRH-PMF have failed to timely comply with the requirements of CMO 12. Accordingly, Defendant's motion to dismiss pursuant to CMO 12 in member action 3:10-cv-10023 and 3:09-cv-10217 are dismissed without prejudice.⁴

The Court hereby Orders as follows:

Defendant's motion to dismiss is granted in part and denied in part. With respect to member actions 3:10-cv-20168, 3:09-cv-20005, 3:09-cv-20002, and 3:10-cv-20004 Defendant's motion is denied as moot. With respect to member actions 3:10-cv-10023 and 3:09-cv-10217 Defendant's motion is granted; member 3:10-cv-10023 and 3:09-cv-10217 actions are dismissed without prejudice for failure to comply with the provisions of CMO 12.

SO ORDERED

/s/ David&Herndon

Chief Judge United States District Court **Date: August 12, 2010**

⁴ The Court notes that CM/ECE;

⁴ The Court notes that CM/ECF inaccurately states that Plaintiffs had until August 10, 2010 to respond to Defendant's motion to dismiss. Pursuant to CMO 12, the responsive deadline was July 22, 2010 (14 days from the date of the motion to dismiss). When deadlines provided by CM/ECF conflict with orders of this Court, the Court ordered deadline will always control. Plaintiffs, however, have failed to meet either deadline.